

From: Steve Macaulay
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2004 4:23 PM
To: Dabbs, Paul
Subject: Chapter 6 comments

Paul --

Here's a Word version of the comments I handed to you in the meeting today.

Regards,

Steve

Comments on Implementation Strategy 1-13-2004

This is a great start, and is fairly comprehensive. We have some comments:

Comments, Chapter 6 Text

1. Need to add something about evaluating existing infrastructure to identify any needs (including conveyance, treatment, storage) that exist to take advantage of opportunities for water use efficiency investments, water transfers, and other strategies to reduce demand and/or increase supply. Each of the 25 water management strategies is not independent of the other. This interdependence should be noted up front.
2. Page 2: Why is the phrase “state sponsored storage projects” used? Evaluation of surface storage pursuant to the CALFED ROD is being done with funding from DWR, but that is not the same as this phrase.
3. Page 5: The intent of the wording of item 1.a. is unclear.
4. Page 6: Why is surface storage the only tool for which “technical, environmental and economic feasibility” is mentioned? Are they Bay-Delta Program “principles”, or just common sense and good planning?
5. Page 8: The “how” discussion for environmental justice is so general as to leave a reader clueless as to what this is talking about. Some examples might help.
6. Page 10: Item 11 deals with adding a water element to general plans. In that context it is unclear what the “strategic business plan” is. DWR’s strategic business plan? Most people are not likely to know it exists, let alone what it says. More explanation could help.
7. Page 12: The second paragraph mentions the “\$1 billion per year” investment need. There really needs to be a discussion about the consequences of this not happening, since it won’t happen (not at least in the foreseeable future).
8. Page 13: The first paragraph of Part V uses the phrase “reducing required consumptive water demand”. This may need further explanation. Is the report trying to say reduce water demand, or reduce consumptive water demand? And what does the word “required” add here?
9. Page 15: The first paragraph talks about a future strategy (for Water Plan 2008) for developing scenarios, using average “representative” conditions. This discussion and others elsewhere need to recognize that not all water management strategies are fixed; some are variable, such as water conservation savings resulting from public education, and certainly the tool of short-term water transfers. It would be very helpful if the report could insert a representative water supply reliability curve and discuss its components – including different water management strategies to employ at different areas along the curve. This approach is getting more and more into the mainstream of water management thinking, and is a clear graphic means of describing the complexity of meeting water needs.

Comments, Table 6-2

1. Page 4, Watershed Management: should include “Local Utility” under “Local Programs”
2. Page 6, System Reoperation: should include “Local Utility”
3. Page 7, Urban Water Use Efficiency: should include “Local Utility”

Comments, Table 6-3

1. Page 1, Conjunctive Management and Groundwater Storage: should specifically mention development of an appropriate monitoring network
2. Page 2, Conveyance: it is unclear of the meaning of “local and regional water supply reliability within a region”. What is the implementation challenge here? Is it quantifying such reliability?
3. Page 2, Ecosystem Restoration: What does “assessment of environmental flows” mean (i.e. what is the challenge)? Should add the following two items – (1) potential impacts to water quality and/or other beneficial uses, and (2) long timeframes needed to determine benefits of actions and investments.
4. Page 3, Matching Water Quality to Its Use: These are good challenges, but it is unclear why the CBDA is the only entity responsible for dealing with these issues (see page 2, Table 6-2).
5. Page 3, Recharge Area Protection: It might be important to add something like water rights protection.
6. Page 5, Water Transfers: The phrase “using limited duration transfers for long-term demands” needs further explanation. While the concern is probably a long-term reliance on a temporary supply, it ignores the fact that water transfers are a variable as well as a fixed water management tool. See the comment above regarding the discussion on page 15 of the Chapter 6 text.
7. Page 5, Urban Water Use Efficiency: It is unclear why “Program Implementation” is an implementation challenge! Much more specific wording is needed here. Suggest adding (1) the roles, responsibilities and authorities for urban water purveyors, and (2) financial and other incentives.